

Selected Articles from *The Individual* January 1999

Since 2002, each new issue of the SIF's journal, *The Individual*, has been uploaded onto the SIF's website at www.individualist.org.uk as a PDF file. Before that, online availability was very limited.

To remedy this, we have reconstructed back-issues of the journal using only the core articles. We hope that you will find them of interest. Any comments should be directed to the current editor of *The Individual* at editor@individualist.org.uk.

Please note that views expressed herein are not necessarily those of the SIF but are printed as a contribution to debate.

Title	Page
<i>The 'Third Way' of Justice?</i> - Paul Anderton	2
<i>An Addict Writes</i> - Dr Robert Lefever	4
<i>Ayn Rand's Philosophy of Objectivism</i> - Professor Edward Younkins	5
Review of Friedrich Hayek's <i>The Intellectuals & Socialism</i> - Professor Antony Flew	8

THE 'THIRD WAY' OF JUSTICE?

Paul Anderton

On the 13 March 1997 Tony and Cherie Blair tried to have a certain Robert Henderson put in prison. Through Belgravia police, they attempted, but comprehensively failed, to have him prosecuted for three separate criminal offences, namely common assault and breaches of the Malicious Communications and Race Relations Acts. After the failure to have Mr Henderson prosecuted, Special Branch (definitely) and MI5 (possibly) were set to spy on him

The background to this situation is that in July 1995 a specialist cricket magazine, *Wisden Cricket Monthly* (WCM), published an article by Robert Henderson entitled 'Is It In the Blood?'. This addressed the question of race and culture and its influence on sporting performance. It caused an immense outcry in the media. They all sensationalised and misrepresented the content of the article to which Mr Henderson was allowed no meaningful or unedited reply to this misrepresentation. The upshot of the media vilification and his inability publicly to reply, was that he was left with the public tag of racist, which in 1990s Britain is a synonym for Nazi. From that point onwards he could get no justice from any quarter. The Blairs went to the police after Mr. Henderson had written to them seeking their assistance to obtain redress for both the misrepresentation by the media and the failure to act by bodies such as the Press Complaints Commission, and also for the subsequent alleged misbehaviour towards him of his MP, Frank Dobson, and the (black) Labour MP, Diane Abbott. He wrote to Mrs Blair only as a last resort after Tony Blair had persistently refused to address his complaints over a period of ten months.

In the aftermath of "Is It In The Blood?", Frank Dobson refused to take up any of Mr Henderson's complaints against the media in any way despite the fact that these complaints were precisely those which an MP should address, namely matters of general public interest.

Diane Abbott sent Mr Henderson an unsolicited letter in which she got on her anti-racist high horse about "Is it In the Blood?". In view of her later statements about "blue eyed blond Finns" this letter contained such hypocritical gems as 'You show no appreciation of acceptable terminology and mores' and 'As an ex-journalist who still dabbles, I believe that we have a duty to write on a subject we know about. And if we are not fully conversant with the topic to undertake the necessary research.'

As may be concluded from the failure of the police even to interview Mr Henderson, his letters to the Blairs contained no threat, gross abuse, or obscenity. They were short in length and reasonable in number. (He sent Tony Blair 9 letters over ten months, his wife 4. The combined text of the letters to Tony Blair totalled 2675 words: to Cherie Blair 755 words.) He wrote so often only because of the persistent failure of the Blairs to address his complaints. The only racial references in the letters were to publicly reported instances of racism *within*

the Labour Party. Moreover, he only raised those matters after Frank Dobson had gratuitously called him a racist, and Diane Abbott had sent him the letter mentioned above. Mr Henderson only discovered that the Blairs had been to the police through a lurid and apparently libellous Mirror story of 25/3/97 headlined "Pest Targets Blairs". This falsely accused him of having committed a criminal offence against the Blairs, of being a dangerous racist, and of having the mentality of a stalker. It further stated that the Blairs had attempted to lay criminal charges against him and that their complaints were studied by the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). It also claimed that Special Branch had been asked to keep an eye on him. The Mirror story cited *LABOUR HQ* and *SCOTLAND YARD* as its sources. Mr. Henderson obtained fuller details of the Blairs' complaint using the provisions of the Data Protection Act (DPA). These produced a printout of data held at Belgravia Police station. This data confirms the part of the Mirror story which deals with the involvement of the Police, the CPS and Special Branch. It also shows that the Blairs attempted to have him prosecuted on the three charges mentioned above, that the CPS rejected all the complaints in short order, that the Blairs considered and rejected civil action to gag him, and that the security services were appointed to spy on him.

The complaint of common assault is literally absurd. Assault by words alone issued verbally is an offence unknown to English law, let alone assault by the written word alone. The Malicious Communications Act requires there to be one or more of the following: sustained and gross abuse, gross obscenity, or illegitimate threats or libels amounting to criminal libel. The CPS's remarkably rapid rejection of the complaints (on the same day that they were referred) shows that Mr Henderson did not engage in such behaviour. Interestingly, Mrs Blair had recent legal experience in the area of contentious correspondence.

The referral under the Race Relations Act (RRA) was simply sinister. The part of the act under which charges were considered is Section 70 which runs; A person commits an offence if (a) he publishes or distributes written matter which is threatening, abusive or insulting; or (b) he uses in any public place or at any public meeting words which are threatening, abusive or insulting, in a case where having regard to all the circumstances, hatred is likely to be stirred up against any racial group in Great Britain by the matter or words in question.

There are two points to note. First, no legal expertise whatsoever is required to make a judgement of whether an offence has been committed. It is a purely ideological decision. Second, although the definition is dangerously broad - it would, for example, catch Margaret Thatcher's comment that Britain was in danger of being 'swamped' - it cannot logically be stretched to include complaints by a white person of publicly reported instances of racism committed by blacks and Asians, or of instances of a white referring to black and Asian claims

of racism perpetrated by whites.

The reason that the definition cannot logically be stretched to cover such instances is that the Act does not distinguish in its general provisions between racial or cultural groups, i.e. everyone is equal before the law. Ergo, that which is legal for blacks and Asians to refer to must be legal for whites to mention. Robert Henderson's letters to the Blairs only contained complaints about publicly reported instances of acts of anti-white racism perpetrated by black Labour MPs and complaints from Asians of white sponsored racism within Labour constituency parties. By definition, they could not have constituted an offence.

To the manifest absence of criminal behaviour on Mr Henderson's part may be added the truly incredible fact that the complaints were brought *six weeks* after his last letter to Tony Blair and two weeks after his last letter to Cherie Blair. Therefore, it was not a continued correspondence which prompted the complaint to the police.

Why then did the Blairs make a complaint? Consider these facts. The Blairs went to the police shortly after Mr Henderson began circulating copies of his correspondence with them, Frank Dobson, and Diane Abbott to the media and the Tory party. This correspondence showed Blair to be both arrogant and unwilling to discipline his own MPs, Dobson to be straightforwardly refusing to do his duty as his MP (presumably for party and ideological reasons), and Abbott to be hypocritical. A very different picture from that of the New Moral Labour Party which Blair had assiduously built. There was also the incredibly unpleasant and dangerous (for Labour) fact that he was pointing to the racist mote in Labour's eye. That Blair should consider getting himself involved in criminal cases during the most important six weeks [the 1997 pre-election period] of his life shows how much he feared these facts being made public.

Since they went to the police in March 1997, the Blairs have refused to answer his complaints and enquiries to them about their behaviour and the *Mirror* article in any way. They have failed to take criminal or civil action against him since the publication of the *Mirror* story, despite the fact that they know that he has given a very wide distribution to accusations against them which if untrue would be massively libellous. Both Mr Henderson's MP, Frank Dobson, and the Labour Party General secretaries, Tom Sawyer and Mary McDonagh, have refused to investigate his complaints against either the Blairs or the Labour Party *Mirror* informants.

The *Mirror* staff have refused to either defend their story or allow Mr Henderson an opportunity to reply. The *Mirror* editor, Piers Morgan, has admitted in a letter to the PCC that he does not have any letters to substantiate his story.

The full extent of Mr Henderson's efforts to enlist the help of those in a position of power or influence can be seen from the accompanying table. The uniformity of response has been complete. Not one of the individuals or organisations he has contacted has been willing even to meet him to discuss the matter, let alone take up his case. Perhaps the most extraordinary part of the affair is the utter failure of the media to take up the story.

Consider what they have universally ignored since March 1997. The *Mirror* story is sensational both in content and presentation. It involved the man who was almost certainly to become Prime Minister. A general election campaign was about officially to commence. Yet not one newspaper or broadcaster took up the story or approached him. Nor, despite the most immense efforts, has he been able to elicit any overt media interest either before or since the election.

What could the media have done without any fear of libel suits from the Blairs? They could have approached Mr Henderson for an interview. They could have run after the *Mirror* story. They could have pursued the involvement of Labour HQ and the Police.

Blair could also have been asked the following questions without running the risk of libel. Why did he wait for six weeks after Mr Henderson's last letter to him before going to the police? Having attempted to have Mr Henderson prosecuted for criminal offences, why did he never take civil action - with its much lower standard of proof - against him? How could two such experienced lawyers as the Blairs be so mistaken about the validity of their complaints that the CPS rejected them on the day they were referred to them?

Mr Henderson has hard evidence (seen by myself) that further action will be taken against him when Blair feels it safe to do so. The Belgravia police printout contains two seemingly banal phrases. The first is "[Blair] did not wish, with an election looming to start collecting evidence against an irritant like Henderson"; the second: "There is no further action to take at present by officers from Belgravia".

Consider those statements against these facts. The only contact Mr. Henderson has ever had with the Blairs is by letter. The only evidence the police had were his letters. The CPS had summarily refused the Blairs' complaints. He was officially guilty of no crime. Therefore, the police by definition had no legitimate reason to investigate him further. The same general objection applies to the use of the security services to spy on him. So why the suggestion that further action might be taken in future?

Mr Henderson also has evidence of the Blairs' political motivation in making the complaints against him and their personal animosity towards him. A letter from Bob Farley of the Metropolitan Police's DPA administration office states that the Blairs made these statements on the Belgravia Police record: that Mr Henderson had "far right wing views" (political motivation based on the false premise that Mr Henderson is an extreme right-winger) and "an irritant like Henderson" (personal animosity).

The most sinister aspect of this affair is the manner in which the justice system has failed. From the Crown Prosecution Service and the police Mr Henderson believes that he has met with nothing but wilful obstruction in his attempts to investigate exactly what happened - the police essentially refuse to correspond with him, while the CPS engages in unending prevarication. Moreover, the complaints he has made to the police have been treated in a manner which ranges from the wilfully incompetent to the unreservedly corrupt. The most blatant maladministration of justice is the Metropolitan Police's

refusal to record a complaint against the *Mirror* and an unnamed police source. The *Mirror* has admitted in writing to the PCC that they received information about the Blairs' complaints against him from a police officer in circumstances which can only have been illegitimate. The Met have refused to record the complaint. The Police Complaints Authority claim that they cannot act unless a complaint is recorded. The logic of this is that the police can get rid of any complaint by the simple procedure of not recording it.

Equally worryingly, when Mr Henderson has tried to get solicitors to take up the case, every single one has refused, either on the grounds that they are too busy or that Cherie Blair works for them.

The bottom line is that while Blair remains as Prime Minister, Mr Henderson is effectively without the protection of the law. Is this what we all might expect in the future from Tony Blair's New Labour 'Third Way' Britain?

Individuals and Organisations who refused help.

POLITICS

All current Tory MPs (164); Each Cabinet Minister; Two

dozen Labour "rebels"; Paddy Ashdown; The leaders of every minority Commons Party; Martin Bell; Several dozen ex MPs; A dozen cross-bench lords; The Speaker.

JUSTICE

The DPP; The Metropolitan Police Commissioner; The head of Special Branch; Each Law Lord; The Crown Prosecution Service; The Metropolitan Police; The Metropolitan Police Committee; The Interception of Communications Tribunal; The Security Service Tribunal.

THE MEDIA

All National Newspapers; The Press Complaints Commission; The BBC, ITN, and Channel 4; John Birt (BBC Director General); Each BBC governor; The Broadcasting Complaints Commission.

OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Justice, Liberty, The Freedom Association, and Charter 88.

A longer and more detailed consideration of Robert Henderson's, written by **Sean Gabb** is now available, or very soon will be, on the internet address www.old.whig@virgin.net.

AN ADDICT WRITES

Dr Robert Lefever

David Wedgwood, Kenneth Eckersley, and Paul Anderton have each written articles for *The Individual* on the subject of drugs. To my mind, as an addict myself, with addicts in my family and with twelve years experience of seeing three hundred and fifty addicted patients on an out-patient basis each year, I would say to each of these writers "Close - but no cigar".

Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged* revolutionised my political thinking. I resigned from the National Health Service and to this day I work in fully private medical practice. If work for the State were to become compulsory I would go on strike and refuse to work as a doctor, my chosen profession for over thirty years. In my time I have been an advisor to the Libertarian Alliance and on the night of the Brighton bomb I spoke at a fringe meeting of the Conservative Party on the subject of decriminalisation of drugs (I don't think the bomb was aimed at me). I was a signatory to the recent *Independent* campaign for the decriminalisation of drugs. My libertarian credentials could hardly be better.

Yet on the subject of drugs I often find myself in disagreement with other libertarians - a process which I consider intellectually healthy - perhaps because I know something about the subject. I do not argue that one has to be an addict in order to understand anything about addiction (indeed, active addiction takes one progressively further away from understanding anything at all) but it certainly helps.

The thinking part of my brain enables me to function effectively, professionally and personally, but it has always been

easily over-ridden by the emotional component. I have always taken actions because they influenced my mood. Subsequently I rationalise them. I like Terry Patchett's description of Captain Vimes (*Guards! Guards!*: Corgi Books) as being born two drinks short, always trying to catch up, but repeatedly getting the dose wrong.

My wife, whose father died from alcoholism, thinks and acts rationally. After thirty-seven years of married life I still don't understand her. My father is red/green colour blind. I cannot imagine the world through his eyes. So what? We still have plenty in common and our relationships are not damaged but enhanced by acceptance of our differences. My wife and father use mood-altering substances and processes socially and can regularly control their use. I can't: once I start to use them in any day I lose the ability to predict further use or abstinence. I have discovered, painfully, that it is better for me not to start.

However, mere self-control puts me into the wretched "dry-drunk" state in which I crave mood-alteration but deliberately resist it. In such circumstances I am poor company. Only by reaching out to help other addicts anonymously am I able to substitute that benign mood-altering process for the damaging mood-altering substances, or process, I previously used.

I don't expect others to understand this aspect of my nature - any more than I understand my wife or father - nor do I expect people to make allowances for me. I alone am responsible for my thoughts, feelings, actions and reactions. I acknowledge that my eyes are short-sighted and I therefore wear

glasses in order to be functional. There are things I cannot do (see under water) and things I have to do (wear my glasses each day if I am not to damage myself and other people). By the same token, each day I have to acknowledge that I am an addict by nature and do or do not do various things in order to keep myself functional and in equanimity.

But the analogy with short-sight has one fundamental flaw: I have never had any doubt that I am short-sighted but I have repeatedly and exceedingly firmly resisted any concept that I might be an addict. Addictive disease (the tendency - probably genetically inherited - that leads one to towards the use of mood-altering substances and processes, rather than simply the use of those mood-altering substances and processes themselves), affects my perception. Indeed, the most pernicious aspect of addictive disease is that it "tells" me that I haven't got it. As with any other addict, I had to learn the hard way: through the painful consequences of my behaviour. It is precisely this aspect of my understanding that sets me apart from some libertarians. I had no freedom when I could not perceive my defect. I had my full set of intellectual armour but no insight. Even now I am happy to apply all libertarian principles on the use of mood-altering substances and behaviours to my wife and father - but they don't apply to me. I recall my son Robin (another addict and now the director of our treatment centre) being dumfounded when, after an operation, my wife refused an offer of an injection of Morphine on the grounds that she was not in sufficient pain. "Freebie, mum, freebie", he said, to my full comprehension but not to hers.

I believe addicts have a defect in neuro-transmission in the mood centres of the brain. We lack sufficient receptors for the chemicals that transfer electrical signals from one nerve cell to the next. We discover for ourselves the substances and processes that have the capacity to augment that process: alcohol, cannabis and cocaine work, rhubarb and potatoes do not. Small wonder that we addicts clamour for the decriminalisation (if not the actual legalisation) of substances that we hold so dear. Indeed, for us these substances have often been life-saving. (The Samaritans estimate that thirty to forty per cent of all suicides are in alcoholics alone so the proportion will be significantly higher when all addicts are taken into account). Only when these substances become damaging through repeated use do we become concerned that they might be harmful as well as helpful to us. Then, when we find that we can't give up once we start to use them in any day, we question our own intelligence, will-power, maturity, and sanity. Small wonder so many commit suicide.

I see no reason why my wife and father should be prohibited from using mood-altering substances simply because my son and I have discovered that we lack the innate ability to use them sensibly and responsibly. However, for my wife and father that permission or restriction is no big deal. Given the opportunity to use a mood-altering substance, be it legal or illegal, prescribed, social, or normally classified as food, they are indifferent whereas my son and I have very firm views indeed and we gaze at our benighted family members with total incredulity, just as they gaze at us with corresponding confusion.

If we are to have a government (and I remain unconvinced on the virtue of such a concept) then we should give it information. One in five of all hospital beds are occupied by people with alcohol-related conditions. One in two of all people seen in Accident and Emergency Departments are there as a result of use of alcohol or drugs. Five people a day die of the effects of illegal drugs, one hundred from alcohol, three hundred from nicotine. Methadone (the "safe" substitute) now kills more people than heroin.

The tendency towards addictive behaviour knows no economic or social boundaries but runs in families. Instead of teaching medical students how to treat the consequences of addictive behaviour (cancers, heart attacks, liver disease, overdoses, AIDS, and so on) we should teach them to identify addictive disease itself and refer patients to specialist centres that know how to deal with it through total abstinence 'one day at a time.'

Instead of frightening (and hence subjugating) the entire population we should target primarily those families who are most at risk - those in whom there is an existing history of addiction of one kind or another - and do what we can to help them before they destroy themselves and other people. There would be no massive influx of illegal drugs into our country if there were no addicts clamouring for them. The fault, dear minister, lies in ourselves.

Libertarian I remain. My work for addicts is to help them to be free from compulsion. In this respect the external compulsions that come from the State or from social convention are nothing in comparison with the intensity of the compulsions that come from within. I don't like the State but I like my own addictive nature, and that of others like me, even less. We need to fight our battles in the right order.

AYN RAND'S PHILOSOPHY OF OBJECTIVISM

Professor Edward W. Younkins

Ayn Rand (1905-1982), a best selling novelist and world-renowned philosopher, deductively developed a unique philosophical system called Objectivism which has affected many lives over the last half century. This article represents an introduction to her systematic vision by presenting her essential

ideas in a logical, accessible manner. This should contribute toward the appreciation of Rand's profoundly original philosophical system.

The specific purpose of this paper is to introduce, logically

rearrange, and clarify through rewording the ideas scattered throughout her essays, lectures, and novels, especially *Atlas Shrugged* (1957), her masterwork of logic that most completely expounds her exhaustive, fully-integrated, philosophy. Written from the viewpoint of a generalist in economics, philosophy, and the social sciences, this paper is meant to provide a background for readers who wish to study specialised aspects of Rand's philosophy in greater detail.

The Essence of Objectivism

Hierarchically, philosophy, including its metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical dimensions, precedes and determines politics which, in turn, precedes and determines economics. Rand bases her metaphysics on the idea that reality is objective and absolute. Epistemologically, the Randian view is that man's mind is competent to achieve objectively valid knowledge of that which exists. Rand's moral theory of self-interest is derived from man's nature as a rational being and end in himself, recognises man's right to think and act according to his freely-chosen principles, and reflects a man's potential to be the best person he can be in the context of his existing circumstances. This leads to the notion of the complete separation of political power and economic power: that proper government should have no economic favours to convey. The role of the government is, thus, to protect man's natural rights through the use of force, but only in retaliation and only against those who initiate the use of force.

Capitalism, the resulting economic system, is based on the recognition of individual rights, including property rights, in which all property is privately owned. For Rand, capitalism, the system of laissez-faire, is the only moral system.

A is A: Deriving the "Ought" from the "Is"

Rand's defence of the above positions begins with the premise that existence exists: A is A. Her philosophy, Objectivism, contends that the universe has existed eternally and repudiates the idea of its creation by a rational, omnipotent God.

Objectivism's ethical system rests upon the claim to have derived the "ought" from the "is." The defence of this claim starts by inquiring about the facts of existence and man's nature that result in value: that which one acts to gain and/or keep. The concept of value presupposes an entity capable of acting to attain a goal in the face of an alternative. Where no alternative exists, no goals and therefore no values are possible. The one basic alternative in the world is existence vs. non-existence. Since the existence of inanimate matter is unconditional, it is only a living organism that faces the constant alternative of life or death. Inanimate matter may change forms, but it cannot go out of existence. When a living organism dies, however, its basic physical elements remain, but its life ceases to exist. Life, the process of self-sustaining and self-generated action, makes the concept of "value" meaningful. An organism's life is its standard of value. Whatever furthers its life is good and that which threatens it is evil.

The nature of a living entity determines what it ought to do. All living entities, with the exception of man, are determined by their nature to undertake automatically the actions necessary to sustain their survival.

Man, like an animal or a plant, must act in order to live and must gain the values that his life requires. Man's distinctive nature, however, is that he has no automatic means of survival. Man does not function by automatic sensory or chemical reactions. Thinking, the process of abstraction and conceptualisation, is necessary for man's survival. Thinking, man's basic virtue, is exercised by choice: man is a being of volitional consciousness.

Reason, the faculty that perceives, identifies, and integrates the material provided by the senses, does not work automatically. Man is free to think or not to think. The tool of thought is logic: the act of non-contradictory identification.

According to Rand, man has no innate knowledge and, therefore, must determine through thought the goals, actions, and values upon which his life depends. He must discover what will further his own unique and precious individual human life and what will harm it. Refusal to recognise and act according to the facts of reality will result in his destruction.

The Randian view is that the senses enable man to perceive reality, that knowledge can only be gained through the senses, and that the senses are able to provide objectively valid knowledge of reality.

For man to survive, he must discern the principles of action necessary to direct him in his relationships with other men and with nature. Man's need for these principles is his need for a code of morality. Men are essentially independent beings with free will; therefore, it is up to each individual to choose his code of values using the standard that is required for the life of a human being. If life as a man is one's purpose, he has the right to live as a rational being. To live, man must think, act, and create the values his life requires.

Without self-value, no other values are possible. Self-value has to be earned by thinking. Morality, a practical, selfish necessity, requires the use of man's rational faculty and the freedom to act on his judgements. A code of values accepted by rational choice is a code of morality: choice is the foundation of virtue. Happiness is the state of consciousness that results from the achievement of one's values.

Since men are creatures who think and act according to principle, a doctrine of rights ensures that an individual's choice to live by those principles is not violated by other human beings. For Rand, all individuals possess the same rights to freely pursue their own goals. Since a free man chooses his own actions, he can be held responsible for them.

Values and Virtues

Rand explains that to live, men must hold three ruling values: reason, purpose, and self-esteem. These values imply all of the virtues required by a man's life. Rationality, the primary virtue, is the recognition of objective reality, commitment to its perception, and the acceptance of reason as a man's only judge of values and guide to knowledge and action. Independence, the acceptance of one's intellectual responsibility for one's own existence, requires that a man form his own judgements and that he support himself by the work of his own mind. Honesty, the selfish refusal to seek values by faking reality, recog-

nises that the unreal can have no value. Integrity, the refusal to permit a breach between thought and action, acknowledges the fact that man is an indivisible, integrated entity of mind and body. Justice, a form of faithfulness to reality, is the virtue of granting to each man that which he objectively deserves. Justice is the expression of man's rationality in his dealings with other men and involves seeking and granting the earned. A trader, a man of justice, earns what he receives and neither gives nor takes the undeserved. Just as he does not work except in exchange for something of economic value, he also does not give his love, friendship, or esteem except in trade for the pleasure he receives from the virtues of individuals he respects. Love, friendship, and esteem, as moral tributes, are caused and must be earned. Productiveness, the virtue of creating material values, is the art of translating one's thoughts and goals into reality. Pride, the total of the preceding virtues, can be thought of as moral ambitiousness.

Capitalism and Individual Rights

Rand's justification of capitalism is that it is a system based on the logically derived code of morality outlined above: a code of morality that recognises man's metaphysical nature and the supremacy of reason, rationality, and individualism. The ruling principle of capitalism is justice. The overall social effect - the fact that individuals and groups who live under capitalism prosper - is simply a by-product or secondary consequence. Political and economic systems and institutions which encourage and protect individual rights, freedom, and happiness are proper systems.

A right is a moral principle defining and sanctioning a man's freedom of action in a social context. According to Rand, rights are innate and can be logically derived from man's nature and needs. The state is not involved in the creation of rights and simply exists to protect an individual's natural rights. There are no group rights -- only individual rights. Group rights are arbitrary and imply special interests.

Humans are material beings who require material goods to sustain their existence. If one's life is the standard, man has the right to live and pursue values as his survival requires. He has the right to work for and keep the fruits of his labour -- the right of property. Without property rights, no other rights are possible. A man who has no right to the product of his efforts is not free to pursue his happiness and has no means to sustain his life.

A violation of a man's property rights is an expression of force against the man himself. The purpose of government is to protect man's rights (including property rights) and enforce contractual agreements: a breach of contract is an indirect use of force. The state's function is thus restricted to the retaliatory use of force.

Under Randian capitalism, which historically has never existed, there is a complete separation of state and economics. Men deal with each other voluntarily by individual choice and free trade to their mutual benefit. The profit motive is just and moral. Profit is made through moral virtue and measures the creation of wealth by the profit-earner. The market price is objectively determined in the free market and represents the lowest price a buyer can find and the highest price a seller can

obtain. Freedom guarantees that both parties will benefit: no one is willing to enter into a one-sided bargain to his detriment.

A person's wealth under capitalism depends on his productive achievements and the choice of others to recognise them. Rewards are tied to production, ability and merit. A producer can do with his wealth what he chooses. Charity is rational, objective, and genuine when, rather than being offered indiscriminately, it is offered only to those who deserve it. Generosity toward those who are innocent victims of injustice or who are fighting against adversity is proper. It is wrong to help persons with no virtue. By giving unconditionally you deceive the recipient into thinking that wealth and happiness are free. Charity must be voluntary. Forced redistribution will result in the curtailment of effort of the productive and a decrease in the amount of real wealth (i.e., real virtue) within society (1).

Randian Scholarship: Problems and Controversies

As to be expected, Rand's original system of thought has not gone without criticism. A few of the most common criticisms are discussed below.

Rand claims that all of a man's knowledge of reality comes through the senses. She also takes for granted the validity and objectivity of the senses. Nowhere does she disprove that knowledge can be gained through and/or enhanced by other sources such as revelation by God, existential encounters, mystical experiences, and the human emotions. Knowledge that comes through a man's senses varies with respect to its accuracy. Concepts are abstractions and are not equal to their referents. Not only are man's senses and brain fallible, he is also limited by his own subjectivity and perspective: alone he may be able to perceive some aspect of reality, but very seldom can he see the whole picture. In those cases in which he does perceive reality accurately, he cannot totally prove it since if, as Rand maintains, the senses and the brain are the only means by which we know reality, there is no way to compare reality with perceptions created by the brain.

Rand contends there are no reasons to believe in God. For her, the idea of God is offensive and humiliating to man since it would mean that man is not the highest being in the world. Her position is that without God it is up to man alone to pursue his own happiness and create his own values. Freedom for Rand means the non-existence of a Creator. Nowhere, however, does she attempt to refute arguments for the existence of God such as Aristotle's unmoved mover, Aquinas' five proofs, Anselm's ontological argument, and James' argument from mystical experience.

Rand's repudiation of altruism seems to be due to the unusual way that she defines the term. Her idea of altruism is that man must selflessly place the welfare of others above his own. A more common idea, however, is that altruism is a man's concern for or dedication to others' interests in addition to his own. Charity, compassion, and the desire to give pleasure to others can have their place in human relationships as long as they do not play a principal, determining role, or are accomplished through the involuntary redistribution of individuals' wealth.

According to Rand, it is wrong to help a person with no virtues. To the Christian, however, life's right action involves consideration for the welfare of all others: every person is an end in himself and is potentially redeemable. Perhaps Rand should have simply stated that charity must be freely given and left it at that (2).

Ayn Rand: A Radical But Serious Scholar

Despite inciting a number of vehement and critical commentaries, Rand's controversial, original, and systematic philosophical positions should be taken seriously and treated with respect. She persuasively expounded a fully integrated defence of capitalism and the component metaphysical, epistemological, psychological, ethical, social, political, cultural and historical conditions necessary for its establishment and survival. Rand presented Objectivism as an integrated new system of thought with an organised, hierarchical structure. Whatever one's ultimate evaluation of her theories, Rand's unique vision should be considered worthy of comprehensive, scholarly examination.

Endnotes

1. Readers wishing to study Rand's work in more detail should see: Douglas Den Uyl and Douglas Rasmussen, eds., *The Philosophical Thought of Ayn Rand* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984); Leonard Peikoff, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand* (New York: Dutton, 1991); Ronald E. Merrill, *The Ideas of Ayn Rand* (La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1991); and Chris Sciabarra, *Ayn Rand - The Russian Radical* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995).

2. Extended critiques of Objectivism have been offered by the following: Albert Ellis, *Is Objectivism a Religion?* (New York; Lyle Stuart, 1968); William F. O'Neil, *With Charity Toward None: An Analysis of Ayn Rand's Philosophy* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1971); and John W. Robbins, *Answer to Ayn Rand: A Critique of the Philosophy of Objectivism* (Washington, D. C.: Mount Vernon Publishing Company, 1974).

Dr. Younkins is Professor of Accountancy and Business Administration at Wheeling Jesuit University, USA.

REVIEW OF FRIEDRICH HAYEK'S *THE INTELLECTUALS AND SOCIALISM*

Professor Antony Flew

London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1998), pp. viii + 28. £4.00. This is a reprint of an essay first published in 1949. To enable readers to appreciate its importance and its enormous though indirect influence it is furnished with a Foreword by the President of the Heritage Foundation in the USA and an Introduction by the General Director of the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) in London. The story begins in April 1945 when the Readers Digest published a condensed version of Hayek's classic work - he always referred to it as a pamphlet - *The Road to Serfdom*.

Among the many people whom it influenced permanently and profoundly was a Battle of Britain fighter pilot turned businessman called Antony Fisher. Wanting to play his part in the struggle to implement the ideas advocated in that pamphlet, Fisher went to the London School of Economics to ask Hayek's advice. Fisher had been thinking of embarking upon a political career. But Hayek insisted that this would be a waste of time. His advice, which Fisher was to take just so soon as he had made sufficient money by the farming of chickens to enable him to fund the foundation of the IEA, was to "join with others in forming a scholarly research organisation to supply intellectuals in universities, schools, journalism, and broadcasting with authoritative studies of the economic theory of markets and its application to practical affairs."

Hayek's essay on *The Intellectuals and Socialism* develops the argument which led him to give that advice. For him here intellectuals are "professional second-hand dealers in ideas", and in this understanding intellectuals in a modern democratic

state constitute a substantial class.

Its members need to be neither original thinkers nor experts in a particular field. What qualifies people as intellectuals in this sense is the wide range of subjects on which they can talk or write, and the positions or habits through which they become acquainted with new ideas sooner than those to whom they address themselves. This class consists not only of journalists, teachers, ministers of religion, radio and television commentators, and writers of books, but also of workers in many other fields who, because of their expert knowledge of their own subjects, are listened to with respect on many other matters.

Hayek's generously evidenced thesis is that, although the direct and immediate political influence of such intellectuals is in any case negligible, in the long run it can be and in fact has been both enormous and overwhelmingly socialist. When *The Road to Serfdom* was first published the term 'socialism' had to be construed as referring - in the words of Clause IV of the Constitution of the [Old] Labour Party - to "the public ownership of all the means of production, distribution and exchange." In 1976, in his Preface to the Second Edition of *The Road to Serfdom*, Hayek took note of a second sense: the word 'socialism' had now "come to mean chiefly the extensive redistribution of incomes through taxation and the institutions of the welfare state." But he still insisted that, under socialism in this second sense, a sense which is perhaps best described as social democratic, "the effects I discuss in this book are brought about, more slowly, indirectly and imperfectly."